

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13 and 15-18 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-5, 10, 13, 16 and 17 are amended, and claims 8, 12 and 14 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Support for the amendments are found in the canceled claims. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representatives by Examiners Cheung and Laneau in the December 17, 2007 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claim 17 is amended to obviate the rejection. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 5 and 17 are amended to obviate the rejection. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 9 and 13 are amended to increase clarity and to correct informalities.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,558,258 to Rupert et al. (Rupert) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,503,144 to Rimoto et al. (Rimoto). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features similar to those recited in canceled claims 8, 12 and 14. Claim 14 is not rejected under this rejection. Therefore, Rupert and Rimoto do not teach or suggest at least the features recited in canceled claim 14.

In addition, claim 1 recites outputting an area which is not a power area of any of the plurality of character groups in the game space as a space area, based on the calculated power distribution of each of the plurality of character groups.

As discussed during the interview, according to the Voronoi diagram of Rupert as shown in Fig. 5(a), for example, each area of a divided succor field is always a dominant area of either team. In the idea of Voronoi diagram, it is difficult to determine a "space area," because the Voronoi diagram is a special kind of decomposition of a metric space determined by distances to a specified discrete set of points in the space. In particular, in a Euclidean plane, the boundary of an area is a part of the bisector between these points. Thus, with the Voronoi diagram, a dominant area of each player may be determined but not the "space area," which is not a dominant area, as recited in claim 1.

Rimoto discloses determining whether a catch is possible by determining a movable range from the replaying time of the catching motion data of a fielder. Column 2, lines 25-27 and 33-39 of Rimoto, for example, recites using the future movement range of each player to determine the movable range. This is, however, merely a movable range. In other words, Rimoto merely discloses whether a catch is possible in an area, and not necessarily an area associated with a dominant area of the character group of that player.

Thus, as agreed to during the personal interview, Rupert and Rimoto, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest an area which is not a power area of any of the plurality of character groups in the game space as a space area, as recited in claim 1.

At least for the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Rupert and Rimoto.

Dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 13, 15, 17 and 18 are allowable at least for their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 3, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rupert and Rimoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,874,669 to Ariano et al. (Ariano). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ariano does not overcome the deficiencies of Rupert and Rimoto with respect to claim 1. As such, claims 3, 6 and 7 are allowable at least for their dependence on allowable base claims, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rupert and Rimoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,735,743 to Murata et al. (Murata). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, the features of claim 14 is incorporated into claim 1, and claim 14 is canceled by the Amendment.

Murata is applied for the teaching of a game machine in which a play-by-play announcement is executed by a sound generator. Murata does not teach or suggest an area which is not a power area of any of the plurality of character groups in the game space as a space area, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Murata does not overcome the deficiencies of Rupert and Rimoto with respect to claim 1. As such, claim 1 is patentable over the applied references, as discussed above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 10, 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rupert and Rimoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,149,520 to Takatsuka. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Takatsuka is applied for the teaching of storing graphical information that can be later read and displayed. Takatsuka does not teach or suggest an area which is not a power area of any of the priority of character groups in the game space as a space area, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Takatsuka does not overcome the deficiencies of Rupert and Rimoto with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 10 and 11 are allowable at least for their dependence on claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Claim 16 recites, *inter alia*, an output section for outputting an area which is not a power area of any of the plurality of character groups in the game space as a space area. As discussed above, none of Rupert, Rimoto and Takatsuka teaches or suggests this feature. Therefore, claim 16 is patentably distinct from the applied references. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge  
Registration No. 30,024

John A. Radi  
Registration No. 59,345

WPB:KXH/hms

Attachment:  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: December 21, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--